

Date: Wed, 15 Dec 93 04:30:12 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #527
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 15 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 527

Today's Topics:

ARRL's callsign admin position (2 msgs)
 Brady Bill for Ham Radio?
 Can my wife transmit?
 Question about radio pirating...

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 11 Dec 93 11:20:38 EST
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!avdms8.msfc.nasa.gov!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kb7uv@panix.com (Andrew Funk) writes:

> In article <DTD8Dc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
> >
> >I can agree to some of what you said. United front and all. But before
> >the ARRL desides what _all_ amateurs want, maybe they could come out of
> >the board room and ask a few of us?
>
>
> Maybe your division's director doesn't "come out of the board room", but
> here in the Hudson Division we have a director who is responsive to the
> membership -- and available.
>

> Steve Mendelsohn, WA2DHF, travels throught the division, attending club
> meetings and hamfests. He's always asking for opinions on matters he
> expects to come before the board, and asks for fresh ideas to bring to the
> rest of the board.

(some deleted)

Andy,

My point was that the ARRL seems to attempt to represent ALL
amateurs. NOT just ARRL members. If they choose to do that then they
should take into consideration not only non-members but other groups
opinions. Not make decisions or pronouncements that tend to say to the
world "We, the ARRL are the end all to US amateurs". If you want to take
a united front to the FCC, then do so by FIRST comming to a consensus
with some other groups. THEN approach the FCC.

Maybe the ARRL has attempted this and I am unaware of it.

While the ARRL has the advantage of being large, it has the DISadvantage
of inertia!

--

```
-----
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |
|-----|
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |
|-----|
```

Date: Sat, 11 Dec 93 11:04:08 EST
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <DTD8Dc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
> Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:
> >For the purposes of some recient proposals, I believe, W5YI represented
> >itself as an organization (quoting a membership of all it's
> >subscribers). And W5YI is a VEC, does he do all the work himself?

>
> God, that's a stretch. What does he do for his subscribers besides send him a
> newsletter every N weeks? As for the VEC, he formed a non-profit corporation
> for that specific purpose.

Not MY stretch. It was W5YI's stretch.

> >But, maybe you are right, we need a second national ham group. Anyone
> >wanna help me start one?
>
> Not me; I'd rather fix the one we have.

IF it is fixable. (I am not expressing an opinion one way or the other,
insufficient data.)

>
> >I said "totally".
>
> And I meant what I said: the FCC was going to take some spectrum away from us
> facts be damned. If that isn't totally adversarial, I don't know what is.

It was adversarial over that ONE issue. One issue of disagreement does
not make for a TOTALLY adversarial relationship.

>
> >Private interests had SOMETHING to do with it.
>
> They didn't start it, though...the FCC did, internally.

Not having the exact facts at hand I will accept yours. Point conceded.

> >Jay, I honestly hope that our relationship with the FCC is not as bad as
> >you say (in fact I know it is not from the dealings our area hams have
> >with the FCC). If it were, Amateur Radio would be lost.
>
> The difference there is that the local FCC types are generally sympathetic to
> ham radio...but it's not them that makes policy: it's the ones in Washington,
> and it's _those_ folks who have decided that ham radio isn't worth screwing
> with. They are the ones to whom we need to present a united front.

Interesting point that I could agree with in principle. In practice, I
am not positive about that one. Let me think it over.

> >I can agree to some of what you said. United front and all. But before
> >the ARRL decides what _all_ amateurs want, maybe they could come out of
> >the board room and ask a few of us?
>
> Have you told your director what you think lately?

First, as I said I am not now an ARRL member. If I choose to join (again I am SERIOUSLY considering it) he will be pestered by me night and day. But as it stands right now _I_ don't have a director.

Futher, I am VERY impressed by the attempt of the ARRL to reach hams by a lot of different means. Internet/Usenet connccetions as an example. GREAT work guys! Big points for you on that one.

Again, the ARRL Guys I have met here have been helpfull in the EXTREAM!!! Thank you to ALL you guys (& gals, not to be sexist). And I understand that there are CompuServ addresses too. GREAT!

--

```
-----
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |
|-----|
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |
|-----|
```

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1993 16:08:18 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!
cupnews0.cup.hp.com!jholly@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Brady Bill for Ham Radio?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

prvalko (prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu) wrote:
: Hello.

: Have any of you heard about this new Brady Bill regarding Ham Radio?

: It seems they want to put a five-day waiting period on the purchase of
: any amateur radio capable of transmitting.

: I think it is about time the government steps in to help us. Perhaps
: with the new waiting period, there will be fewer tech-lites on the
: repeaters asking for "personals" and saying, "kick it back" after each
: transmission.

: Hopefully this act will put and end to the senseless murders taking
: place in the DX fraternity as members try to make the Honor Roll, by any
: means necessary.

: If you support Ham Radio, support the Ham Radio Brady Bill!

: Spark Forever!

: =paul= WB8ZJL

What, you mean they have to wait another FIVE days after waiting ten weeks for a license! Oh, I'm sorry, I just found the smiley's.....

Jim, WA6SDM

Date: Sat, 11 Dec 93 10:56:20 EST

From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Can my wife transmit?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) writes:

> In article <1993Dec9.200425.24723@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin.jessup

> <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

> > ... stuff about wife & kid in threatening situation...

>

> My reaction to this would be WHO CARES what the FCC, etc. will do? If someone

> life is in danger the other stuff isn't all that big of a consideration. I'd

> certainly rather have a nasty-gram from the FCC than a tragedy.

Yep, what it boils down to is this. Is the saftey of your family (in any given situation) worth loosing your license over. If so, why worry, have them call for help. No discussion is needed. If it is NOT worth you loosing your license, it MAY not be that big of an emergency.

^^^^^

(Please note Highlight)

> I think it's a good idea that spouses and kids have some idea how to use the

> radio, just for cases like this. In fact, one of the local ham clubs gave a

> seminar at one of the recent hamfests just for kids & spouses about how to us

> the radio in an emergency.

This is a GREAT idea!

> Of course, if you can convince your spouse/kid to get his/her own ticket you
> wouldn't have to worry as much about this kind of thing. The Tech license is
> pretty easy to get esp. with the study aids that are available.

>

> My \$0.02 worth, anyway.

I would say it was worth more than that Mark.

--

```
-----
| Dan Pickersgill N8PKV | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |
| dan@mystis.wariat.org | Personals, Hams have Names' |
-----
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |
-----
```

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 93 23:04:05 PST
From: newshub.nosc.mil!crash!hale!system@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Question about radio pirating...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

```
>
!> You're STILL a fu...<Censored> disgrace to ham radio.
> --
> Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu      | adequately be explained by stupidity.
> "The road to Usenet is littered with dead horses." -- Jack Hamilton
```

....And so is your language, would you please confine your drive to mail.

```
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
System@hale.cts.com      I believed what I was told, I thought it was a
Hale Telecommunications Inc. good life, I thought I was happy. Then I found
619/660-6734 V.32bis     something that changed it all. (Anonymous, 2112)
```

Date: 13 Dec 1993 16:21:14 GMT
From: ghost.dsi.unimi.it!univ-lyon1.fr!elendir@tcgould.tn.cornell.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2e9ftn\$il1@cismsun.univ-lyon1.fr>,
<SDS.93Dec13023946@cslab1e.cs.brown.edu>, <2ei144\$imm@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: Requiring a license to purchase ham gear,...was Re: Why isn't...

sohl,william h (whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
: In article <SDS.93Dec13023946@cslab1e.cs.brown.edu>,
: Scott Swanson <sds@cs.brown.edu> wrote:

: >In article <2e9ftn\$il1@cismsun.univ-lyon1.fr> elendir@enst.fr () writes:
: > something. If it was mandatory to show the ham-licence when buying some
: > equipment, wouldn't it eliminate some problems by avoiding jerks to buy
: > transceivers ?
: >Isn't this standard practice? I know that at the store where I buy
: >all of my equipment, the standard question when they fill out the
: >sales ticket is "Name? Call? Address?"...

: Let's be realistic here. If it became necessary to "see" a license,
: ...
: etc.) which take place throughout the year.

Of course. I know that gift problem. But what else to do ?

Vince.

--

PSG Vainqueurs de la coupe de France 1982, 1983, 1993
PSG Champions de France 1985/86 1/2 Finaliste C3: 1993
PSG PARIS SAINT GERMAIN FC --- NOTRE HISTOIRE DEVIENDRA LEGENDE.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #527

